Equal Rights

VOL. XX, No. 46
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 15, 1934

MAY 14 1935

Anne Clement Rotter

In recognition of her fine work as a lobbyist in behalf of the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment and the adoption of the Equal Rights Treaty, Anne Clement Rotter of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, was elected to membership in the National Council of the Woman's Party at the recent annual Convention of the Party in New York.

Besides being a recognized Feminist leader in her own city and State, Mrs. Rotter is a member of the Congressional Committee of the Party, of which Maud Younger is Chairman.

In August, when the National Association of Women Lawyers, meeting in Chicago, elected Burnita Shelton Matthews as its President, Mrs. Rotter arranged several meetings in Milwaukee at which Mrs. Matthews, who was then counsel of the Woman's Party, and Laura Berrien, its National Treasurer, spoke. In private life she is known as Mrs. Max Rotter.

Equal Rights

OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Atlantic 1210
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street.
Baltimore, Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker . . . . . Editor
Emilie A. Doetsch . . . . Managing Editor
Dora G. Ogle . . . . Business Manager

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Nina E. Allender — Hazel MacKaye
Zoe Beckley — Edna St. Vincent Millay
Ruby A. Black — Ruth Pickering
Lucia Chamberlain — Alice Rohe
Phyllis Duganne — Maryse Rutledge
Ernestine Evans — Miriam Finn Scott
Rose Feld — Doris Stevens
Zona Gale — Betty Gram Swing
Helen Davenport Gibbons — Sophie Treadwell
Rebecca Hourwich — Helena Hill Weed
Inez Haynes Irwin — Brenda Ueland
Ada Davenport Kendall — Mary Winsor
Muna Lee — Ruth Gill Williams
Alma Lutz — Dr. Mary Wilhelmine Williams

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice, Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, $2.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Chairman, Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Vice-Chairmen,
Gail Laughlin, Me.
Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Secretary, Rebekah Greathouse, D. C.
Treasurer, Laura Berrien, D. C.
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.
Parliamentarian, Emma A. Fox, Mich.

Edwina Austin Avery, D. C. — Mary A. Murray, N. Y.
Nina E. Allender, D. C. — Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Mrs. George Lewis Callery, Del. — Alice Paul, N. J.
Mrs. Merritt O. Chance, D. C. — Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N.Y.
Bertha W. Fowler, Colo. — Mrs. Max Rotter, Wis.
Elsie Hill, Conn. — Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
Ines Haynes Irwin, N. Y. — Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md. — Betty Gram Swing, D. C.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif. — Mabel Vernon, D. C.
Alma Lutz, N. Dak. — Mrs. John Jay White, N. Y.
Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill. — Margaret Whittemore, Calif.
Alice Lee Movius, Mass. — Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio
Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues	$10.00
Associate Members	$1.00
Subscribing Members	$3.00
Founders	$100.00
Life Members	$1,000.00
Endowers	$5,000.00
Sustainers	$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 1]
[House Joint Resolution Number 1]

Introduced in the Senate March 10, 1933, by SENATOR JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Delaware.

Introduced in the House March 9, 1933, by REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana.

Facts Triumph Over Prejudice

MARRIED-WOMEN teachers have scored another point under the nation-wide survey conducted by Dr. David Wilber Peters, Director of Instruction for the Virginia Department of Education. After making a study of the qualifications and efficiency of 4,000 married and single teachers, Dr. Peters reached the following conclusions: that married teachers taught longer in the school system, excelled in the average number of positions held, enrolled in more college extension courses, devoted more time to professional and general reading and to preparation for their daily teaching, and were more interested out of the classroom in the general welfare of their communities. On the whole, married teachers took their work more seriously and looked upon it as a lifelong profession. His survey completely refutes the common argument that the married-teacher's home duties detract from her efficiency as a teacher.

Emphasizing the fact that the vital issue in choosing teachers is the welfare of the pupil, Dr. Peters registers himself as opposed to the policy which has become so prevalent throughout the country, the dismissal of married-women teachers. In view of the facts brought to light in his survey, the Virginia Education Association expects to pass a resolution providing that efficiency rather than marital status be the determining factor in the employment of teachers.

We have always maintained that efficiency should be the basis of employment and that the question of whether a teacher is a woman or married or single should not enter into the matter.

The widespread dismissal of married-women teachers is just one more example of the folly of discriminations against women, based as they always are, on prejudice and superficial conclusions.

Let Your Light Shine

ON THE back page of this issue is a facsimile of the Christmas card sent to subscribers who receive EQUAL RIGHTS in their Christmas stockings. Accompanying the drawing is the announcement that those wishing to remember friends at this time of year by making them subscribers to the magazine may obtain three subscriptions for the price of two. In other words, anyone who will invest four dollars at this time will thereby send fifty-two issues of the magazine into three homes.

It is not unlikely that many who receive the paper will, after reading it, turn it over to others. We know that many of our present readers are in the habit of "passing on" their copies to friends and acquaintances. And as it is the aim of the editors of EQUAL RIGHTS to cover every phase of the Feminist movement both here and abroad, and their firm conviction that any fair-minded person who acquaints herself or himself with our movement must thereby feel impelled to take part in it, we urge upon all members of the Party to take this opportunity to increase the circulation of its official organ and the membership of the Party at the same time.

The only way in which this paper can reach its maximum of usefulness is to have every member of the Party consider it her responsibility to see that it gets the widest possible reading. Not everyone can go to Washington and lobby,—or to Montevideo, or Geneva. But those who go on these high and inspiring missions can do so only because thousands and hundreds of thousands stand back of them at home. An Alice Paul, or Doris Stevens, is admitted to great international councils because she is representative of hosts of others who share her views and work. And the greater the number that stand behind these leaders, the greater the possibility, obviously, that their pleas will be heeded.

There is no more potent force in the world in shaping public opinion than the printed word. What has happened at Montevideo and Geneva has made the whole world realize what a power women are when they act en masse. These great events have been publicized by the press, but in newspapers the things that interest us as Feminists are only a part of the news. Many details, important to us, are overlooked. In the daily news, especially as edited by men, Feminism is one of many isms, among them militarism and Fascism. The daily press will not propagandize for us. Men have their rights. To secure Equal Rights is not men's, but women's job.

Give yourself and your friends, your cause and EQUAL RIGHTS a Christmas gift. Be one of those who, we hope, will send the little card with the candle on it into thousands of homes. Make it possible for its light to reach every corner of the world where injustice to women is still tolerated.

Dr. Anna Howard Shaw Memorial Unveiled at Bryn Mawr

By Mary Winsor

THE National Woman's Party was very happy to take part in the Memorial Meeting in honor of Dr. Anna Howard Shaw which was held in the Deanery of Bryn Mawr College, Saturday, November 10. It was Dr. M. Carey Thomas's special request that "Alice Paul's Party" should be represented at this touching and beautiful ceremony, and a delegation consisting of Doris Stevens, Ella Riegel and Mary Winsor was present.

The speakers were Dr. Marion E. Park, Dr. M. Carey Thomas, Mrs. J. O. Miller of the League of Women Voters and ex-President of the Pennsylvania Woman's Suffrage Association, and Mrs. F. Louis Slade of the League of Women Voters, St. Louis. On the platform were Dr. Martha Tracey, Dean of the Woman's Medical College, and Mrs. James Starr, the President, who has done so much to infuse new life into the Woman's Medical College.

The addresses were cordial, intimate and colored with deep feeling. Dr. Park spoke of the Anna Howard Shaw Memorial Fund, the purpose of which was to bring distinguished women lecturers to Bryn Mawr College. Mrs. Slade related the history of the memorial; in 1920, the last meeting of the National American Woman Suffrage Association was held and Carrie Chapman Catt started the work of raising this Memorial Fund to Dr. Shaw. The fund of $44,000 was divided between the Woman's Medical College and Bryn Mawr College. Bryn Mawr College raised an additional $100,000 for the Anna Howard Shaw Memorial Fund of which Miss Thomas raised $33,000.

Mrs. Slade said it was appropriate that this Memorial Meeting should take place in the Deanery, for to this very Deanery came Mrs. Catt and Susan B. Anthony in the hour of their greatest trouble to report that the Suffrage Movement had no money and that the work was at a standstill. They were received with open arms. Mary Garrett took them to Baltimore, opened her house for a large meeting and both forwarded the cause in every way possible.

Mrs. J. O. Miller reviewed the early suffrage struggles in Pennsylvania and gave an amusing account of Dr. Shaw's appearance in the First Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh where she had been invited to preach at the evening service. The three elders whose names Mrs. Miller mercifully did not mention were much alarmed at the prospect and sent word to Mrs. Miller that they hoped "Dr. Shaw would say nothing that would not be fitting for the house of God." Becoming more nervous they tried to make it impossible for Dr. Shaw to preach. But Mrs. Miller with great presence of mind said that if Dr. Shaw were asked to withdraw, Mrs. Miller herself would make the whole controversy public in the Pittsburgh newspapers. Rather than see this happen the elders withdrew their opposition and Dr. Shaw preached a marvelous and inspired sermon to a church packed as it never had been before—people sitting on the window sills and standing in the aisles.

There were also reminiscences of the famous time when President Woodrow Wilson spoke to the National American Woman Suffrage Association Convention at Atlantic City and said nothing at all about suffrage. Dr. Shaw seized the occasion to make a marvelous suffrage speech for the President turning to him at intervals and asking: "Isn't that so, Mr. President?"

Miss Thomas spoke with deep feeling of the great suffrage leaders, telling of her pride that Dr. Shaw often stayed in the Deanery. Dr. Shaw, Miss Thomas said, was doctor of medicine, doctor of divinity, beloved disciple and voice of Susan B. Anthony, and the greatest orator of her generation. She had that touch of genius peculiar to actors and singers and also their temperament, never hesitating to say what she thought and always shocked at the inevitable result of her outspokenness. She was no diplomat and those who loved her would not have it otherwise.

Miss Thomas spoke of the first visit of Mrs. Pankhurst to this country and said that she and Susan B. Anthony were women to die for.

The audience adjourned to the cloisters where the beautiful tablet to Dr. Anna Howard Shaw designed by the sculptor, Paul Manship, was unveiled. At tea, Miss Thomas asked Doris Stevens to tell of the work at Montevideo and expressed keen interest and appreciation.

Open Door International Appeals to the President

IN a letter to President Roosevelt dated November 19, 1934, the Open Door International urges that the United States, which has recently become a member of the International Labor Office, should not "lower its standards to those of the International Labor Office." It is pointed out that the latter has adopted five conventions discriminating against women workers.

The object of the Open Door International is to secure the economic emancipation of the woman worker. Its headquarters are in London and it maintains an office in Geneva, and has national branches and groups and affiliated and associate societies and groups in Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Great Britain, Latvia, Sweden, Finland, France, Hungary, the United States, Palestine, Uruguay, Bulgaria, Burma, Germany, India, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Rumania, South Africa, Switzerland and Yugoslavia.

This international organization will hold its Fourth Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, August 19 to 23, 1935.

The letter to the President reads:

19th November, 1934.

To the President of the United States
of America,
White House,
Washington, U. S. A.

Sir—It is as President of a country which has recently become a member of the International Labor Organization of the League of Nations, that we here bring to your notice the policy we are urging that body to adopt. We have, since our formation in 1929, been putting that policy forward in its relation to the particular questions under discussion at successive sessions of the International Labor Conference and of the Governing Body of the International Labor Office, and at a deputation received by the Bureau of the Governing Body (i. e., the Chairman and the two Vice-chairmen). The governments represented at these sessions, therefore, are well acquainted with our demands, and these we now wish to explain to you as a new member of the International Labor Organization.

The object of our organization is to secure that a woman shall be free to work and protected as a worker on the same terms as a man, and that legislation and regulations dealing with conditions and hours, payment, entry and training shall be based upon the nature of the work and not upon the sex of the worker. And to secure for a woman, irrespective of marriage or childbirth, the right at all times to decide whether or not she shall engage in paid work, and to ensure that no legislation or regulations shall deprive her of this right.

Good and Bad International Labor Conventions

We should first explain that we are not opposed to the regulation of conditions of work. Such regulation may be of benefit to the worker, but only if it applies equally to all workers, men and women alike. A number of the Draft Conventions and of the Recommendations of the International Labor Organization answer this description, as for example the Draft Convention on Night Work in Bakeries (Geneva 1925) which applies equally to both sexes.

But a regulation applied to one sex only in the supposed interest of the workers of that sex does not in fact benefit these workers. The Draft Conventions of 1919 and of 1934 concerning the Night Work of Women, for example, prohibit night work

to women only. Such a prohibition has the effect of creating certain employments into monopolies for the male worker, as for example typesetting for a morning newspaper, and otherwise limits the opportunities of the woman worker and so lowers her status and tends to lower her wages. A night work prohibition made to apply to certain kinds of work and equally applicable to both sexes could, on the other hand, benefit both sexes.

Special Regulations for Young Persons Equal for Boys and Girls

We mention here, too, that we are not opposed to the special regulation of the work of children and young persons. As non-adults, not yet fully developed, they require separate treatment. But here again regulations should apply equally to both sexes. A special regulation in the supposed interest of the female young person which does not at the same time apply to the male, places her at a disadvantage economically and is not real protection.

Pseudo "Protection" Based on Theory of Permanent Subordination of Women.

Legislation which imposes special conditions on the woman worker is misdescribed as "protective." It is not protective. It is economically damaging to the woman as a worker. Its advocates proceed on the assumption that the woman worker is always to be the lower paid, less skilled and lower grade worker. And legislation which supports and perpetuates this idea is keeping the woman down and tending to prevent her escape from lower grade work.

The International Labor Organization has Accepted Without Criticism the Traditional View of the Permanent Subordination of the Woman Worker.

The International Labor Organization has done nothing towards raising the status of the woman worker. It has accepted without thought or discussion the traditional view that the woman worker is to be permanently in a lower grade. It has thus failed to realize that a prohibition which is economically damaging to a man cannot really protect a woman. It was in Great Britain about a century ago that this prohibition of night work was first introduced, when the position of the woman was so low that the married woman did not even own her own wages, when there was no education for women and when women had no political rights. The woman worker was then expected to continue to be a lower grade individual. Other countries have adopted this legislation without criticism. It has to be remembered, too, that the International Labor Organization is made up not only of countries in which women now have political and legal rights but also of those in which women have no political rights and in which the married woman has no independent control of her earnings and may not even enter a contract of employment without the consent of her husband, and of those which are definitely putting obstacles in the way of the woman worker.

United States of America Urged Not to Lower Its Standards to Those of the International Labor Office

While we recognize with regret that certain of the States in the United States of America place restrictions on the hours or conditions of work or wages of women, not also imposed on those of men, we appreciate that there is no general law throughout the country discriminating against her in those ways, and that in many States the general position of women is high. We are encouraged, therefore, to hope that the influence of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization will be in the direction not of supporting and perpetuating the present low status of the woman worker, but of taking steps to raise that status. This can only be done by refusing to accept the view that of necessity she must be kept as a lower grade of worker, and by taking every possible step to improve her status relatively to that of the male worker. The first essential in this direction is to oppose all proposals for regulation of her work, hours or pay in a manner different from that of the male worker.

"SIMPLY A SMOKE SCREEN"

Editor of The Philadelphia Inquirer,
Broad and Callowhill Streets,
Philadelphia, Penna.

Sir:

Why the relentless persecution of women? For that is what the campaign against married women workers is. The plea for the unemployed is simply a smoke screen.

The men and women who shed crocodile tears for the unemployed and who demand that the entire burden of sacrifice be borne by married women and their families could in many cases make sacrifices themselves instead of urging that others, always others, be forced to make the sacrifice.

Mr. Jones and many others have advocated that married women be denied a right which the Pennsylvania Constitution defines as "indefeasible" and "inalienable." A right which must forever remain inviolate.

But you don't hear any of them offering to share their money with or give up their jobs for some unemployed woman or man.

Supposing Mr. Jones has $1,000 in cash and property. He must certainly admit that he is far better off than an unemployed man or woman who has no money. But because of that would Mr. Jones think it just if he were forced to resign his position and live on the $1,000 as long as it lasted? I doubt if he would think we should go that far in helping the unemployed for whom his heart bleeds so profusely.

The courts have upheld in decision after decision the right of an individual to acquire property. And the right to earn has been judged to be property as much as a piece of land.

Here is a typical decision quoted from Purdon's Constitution of Pennsylvania: "The word 'liberty' as used in the clause of this section as to the right to enjoy and defend life and liberty means more than freedom of locomotion. It includes and comprehends among other things freedom of speech, the right of self-defense against unlawful violence, the right to live and work where one will, to earn his (or her) livelihood in any lawful calling, to pursue any lawful trade or avocation, and freely to buy and sell as others may. . . The rights of life and liberty include the right to provide for one's self and family by any lawful means." In another decision, the court ruled that it would be an invasion of rights of property to pass an act which has the effect of depriving a physician of his right to practice his profession—"for a physician's profession is his property."

And a woman's job is her property. To deprive her of it for no reason but marriage is just as much stealing as the kind of theft that is punishable by a prison sentence. But many women have been thus ruthlessly robbed of their property during the depression. And the theft has been applauded. Yet we call America the Land of the Free!

Ruth G. Williams.

Draft International Labor Office Conventions Which Should Not be Ratified or Adopted

In particular we urge that the United States of America do not ratify the following Draft Conventions, and that it seek to have them withdrawn or revised in such a way as to make them apply equally to men and women.

Employment of Women before and after Childbirth (Washington, 1919).

Employment of Women during the Night (Washington, 1919).

White Lead in Painting (Geneva, 1921).

Employment of Women during the Night (Geneva, 1934).

The Minimum Wage Fixing Machinery Convention (Geneva, 1928?).

While this last Draft Convention (Minimum Wage Fixing Machinery) makes no reference to setting up different minimum wages for the two sexes, countries which have put it in force so as to pay lower minima to women under the convention have not been criticized for so doing. The Convention has, therefore, in practice become a great engine for standardizing the wages of women as lower than those of men and so for depressing the status of the woman worker.

In view of the Second Discussion to take place at the 1935 International Labor Conference, we also urge the United States of America to use all its influence to prevent the adoption by that Conference of a Draft Convention to prohibit the work of women in mines or to regulate the work of women underground in a way different from that in which the work of man is regulated.

New Deal for the Woman Worker

The world has been looking with sympathetic interest at the efforts being made in your country to give a new deal to the worker. We hope the United States of America, as a new member of the International Labor Organization, will bring new life and a new ideal into the work of the International Labor Office. One of the most precious rights of the freeman is the right to sell his labor for gain under the same terms as other freemen. Any limitation of this right is a step towards enslavement. The woman worker as a human being should share this right and should not have restrictions placed upon her which make for her enslavement. In too many countries today the economic crisis is being used as an excuse to drive her to the wall. Her unemployment is a matter as serious as the unemployment of the man. The opportunity should be taken in building up a new economic system to build it on the firm foundation of equality and justice. We trust that the influence of the United States of America in the International Labor Office will be towards giving a new deal of equality and justice to the woman worker.

We have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
(Signed) Chrystal Macmillan,
President;
(Signed) Winifred Le Sueur,
Hon. Secretary.

The New Deal That Women Want

By Helena Hill Weed.

Mrs. Weed, a Newspaper Correspondent and Magazine Writer, is one of the Founders and Offical Historian of the National Woman's Party, and an Associate Editor of Equal Rights. This article is reprinted from the November, 1934, number of Current History.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT has said that industrial recovery and reform, with work relief during the depression, are at the heart of the New Deal. Women who are concerned with the dignity and destiny of their sex—like all others directly affected by the new order that is in the making—are asking what this means to them in their long struggle for industrial equality.

Long before the New Deal had been dreamed of, relentless economic pressure had forced women, married as well as single, to become wage-earners. Of the 49,000,000 persons gainfully employed in the United States in 1930 almost 11,000,000 were women, an increase of nearly 100 per cent over the 1920 figures, Married women constituted more than 3,000,000 of that total, an increase of more than 289 per cent since 1900.

As the world has sunk lower and lower into the depths of the depression women have borne a double burden. They have not only suffered from the depression itself but they have been forced to fight, on a world-wide front, against determined assaults upon their right to earn a living. Wherever men have gathered to discuss unemployment relief the first cry has been, "Fire the women, especially the married women, and give their jobs to men." States, municipal governments and school boards have led the way, and their example has been followed by industry and trade, on the theory that in times of stress paid jobs belonged, by right, to men.

Congress in 1932 succumbed to the hysteria. The New Dealers, then in control of the House, slipped a "marital status clause" into the Economy Act. This clause, No. 213, provides that in any reduction of personnel in any branch of the service, married persons, if living with husband or wife, be the first to be dismissed—that is, if the husband or wife was also in the government service. The obvious intent of the clause, though written in terms of sex-equality, was the ousting of married women despite the fact that the Civil Service Act provides that married couples may enter the classified service together.

A STORM of opposition arose when the meaning of Clause 213 was understood. Married men and women whose family obligations compelled both to work besieged the Senate. Fair-minded Senators on both sides of the chamber waged a valiant but fruitless fight to eliminate the clause, on the ground that the government was under contractual relations with those who had already lawfully entered the civil service. But the New Dealers of the House were obdurate, and finally, to save the whole bill, the Senate concurred in their demands. Although President Hoover protested against the injustice of the clause, he signed the bill. At the same time he recommended repeal of "213," as did the Civil Service Commission, which condemned the provision as an attack on the merit system.

Because of the widespread disapproval of the law, almost every office made use of the short, rotating, payless furloughs, also provided for in the Economy Act, to effect necessary economies without dismissals. President Roosevelt was expected to ask for the repeal of this legislation. When the Economy Act of March, 1933, was written, immediately after his inauguration, many clauses of the former act were specifically renewed for the next fiscal year, but no mention was made of "213." The question then was whether this clause was to lapse at the end of the fiscal year in June.

WOMEN threatened with dismissal under "213" appealed to Mrs. Roosevelt and Secretary Perkins—both married women working for pay—and both then denounced "213," as consistency demanded, but the Secretary of Labor, despite the fact that the Federal Woman's Bureau was in her department, said she could do nothing for them and referred the question to the Budget Director. Though he expressed sympathy for married women, he left the decision to the President, who in turn sought a ruling from the Attorney General. In the end it was decided that the marital status clause was permanent legislation.

The fight to oust married women was now on in earnest and with the apparent approval of the President. Since he issued no rules for the uniform application of the furlough system as authorized by the Economy Act, those office chiefs who were prejudiced against the employment of married women were free to begin summary dismissals.

The Adjutant General's office offered a notable example. Though the Civil Service Commission showed that by imposing a ten-day furlough on all the employees of this particular office—less than one day a month for each person during the fiscal year—all required economies could be effected, the suggestion was rejected. Immediately forty-five women, all of them highly efficient workers whose term of service averaged fifteen years and all of them with dependents, were ousted from the service, losing not only their incomes but the right to reappointment and to a civil pension, toward which they had been contributing for years. The personnel officer explained: "These women have husbands to support them." More than 1,600 married couples, it is estimated, and over 4,000 of their dependents, were affected by Clause 213.

Privation and financial loss followed upon these dismissals. Payments on homes which were being bought by instalments, by the combined efforts of husband and wife, could not be kept up, and often the life savings of the couple, which had been invested in the payments already made, were lost as well. Many of their dependents were thrown on public or private charity.

There have been more serious social results. At first many couples, terrified by impending financial disaster, separated in order to keep their jobs. After the Civil Service Commission ruled that separations made to avoid the law would not prevent dismissals some resorted to divorce, on trumped-up charges, though they continued to live together. Engagements were broken. Some young couples in the civil service, denying the right of the government to make them choose between marriage and the right to work, are living together without benefit of clergy. Religious scruples against birth control have been shed from fear of financial disaster.

Proof that this law has worked to the injury of those least able to bear it is given in a recent statement of the chairman of the Civil Service Commission. "In practical operation," he said, "the so-called 'Marital Status Law" has affected the people in the lower-salaried groups to a far greater extent than those in the higher brackets." And he adds: "No one can dispute the greater financial necessity in the homes of the employes receiving small pay. . . . Certainly a law is unfair when it operates largely to further reduce the income of those having small incomes."

MUCH has been said about the unconstitutionality of certain features of the New Deal. Women feel that none can be challenged with greater confidence, or on surer grounds, than the measures already enacted, and those planned for the future, to reimpose unconstitutional minimum-wage laws on working women. Organized labor has always fought such laws for men, as a denial of the constitutional right of every individual to contract for his labor. "The minimum wage," it has been argued,

"always tends to become the maximum wage, and destroys the workers' chances to advance." But William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, admits that labor has never "had any objection to a minimum-wage law for women and children."

Working women insist that a minimum wage is as unlawful and as damaging for women as for men; that if labor organizations insist on collective bargaining as the only fair means for establishing wages, they should bargain for the whole industry, not for men only, and allow all workers, both men and women, to compete, on an equal basis, for available jobs.

Though the Supreme Court in 1923 declared a minimum-wage law for women unconstitutional, it was recognized that this victory had not been consolidated when the New Deal began, for in several States where minimum-wage laws for women had not yet been tested in the courts, attempts were still being made to enforce them. In several others, despite the decision of the Supreme Court, new laws had been written at the urging of President Roosevelt and Secretary Perkins. On the other hand, women did prevent the inclusion of a provision in the National Industrial Recovery Act which would have permitted the President to establish wage discriminations based on sex in the NRA codes.

When the first code, that for cotton textiles, was under consideration, the New Hampshire Federation of Labor proposed discriminations against women workers. Women of every shade of thought on industrial legislation opposed them, because the NRA had promised to establish uniform hour and wage regulations which met all the demands of every group of women. This model code was therefore written in terms of absolute sex equality. Soon, however, codes were proposed establishing discriminatory wage scales, the hourly rate for men being at times 15 cents an hour higher than that for adult women and minors. When the President approved these codes, women protested and Mrs. Roosevelt took up their cause. She called General Johnson to the White House for a conference, and immediately thereafter he announced that codes would require equal pay for equal work.

Codes then began to appear in which a single wage standard was set for all workers, but which carried, in addition, the extraordinary provision, "when females do substantially the same work as males they shall receive the same pay." Women regarded this as an evasion of General Johnson's promise and a direct hint to employers how they might pay lower wages to women than to the men who were working at the same job. Again there were protests, but to no avail; the President signed the codes containing this rule. Discriminatory wages, based flatly on sex, began to reappear in the codes, despite General Johnson's previous promise—and the President signed these codes.

Labor leaders next demanded that in States which still have minimum-wage laws for women upon their statute books the State rate must supersede the code rate if the State rate is higher. Women immediately pointed out that if employers in any State were required by law to pay them a higher wage than men, women would be displaced. They showed that this very thing was then taking place in the States where minimum-wage laws exist. In the face of the doubtful constitutionality of these untested State laws, both the Recovery Administration and the President approved this new discrimination against women, although other laws in conflict with NRA regulations had been ignored.

DISGRACE TO THEIR SEX

Editor of The Philadelphia Inquirer,
Broad and Callowhill Streets,
Philadelphia, Penna.

Sir:

I am ashamed to note that there are so many men who are anxious to deprive women of their rights by suggesting that married women be denied paid employment.

Any one will have to admit that women had nothing to do with causing the depression. They had nothing to do with causing the war. Women have given thousands of work-hours free to all sorts of activities for the benefit of men and women.

And what do they get for their rewards? They find themselves the target for selfish persons who urge that they be denied certain rights which are absolutely and forever the right of every human being.

The women who urge such persecution of their own sex are blind—to put it mildly. The men who suggest persecuting women to make it a little easier for themselves are a disgrace to the masculine sex.

(Signed) A Man.

Recently still another form of discrimination against women has appeared in the codes providing that "equal pay for equal work" shall not apply during those hours when women are not permitted to work. Thus one more opportunity is given to pay men higher wages than women for the same work.

The President never placed a woman in a position of authority in the NRA to protect the interests of the millions of women in industry when these decisions were being made. Their male competitors in the American Federation of Labor, who have always worked for legislation to restrict the competition of women, have had the final, authoritative voice on NRA regulations for women in industry. And the President has approved their unfair proposals.

This determination of the New Deal to re-establish unconstitutional discriminatory wages based on sex is further evinced by the State pacts, now in the making. The pacts are written for the sole purpose of enacting minimum-wage laws for women in the industrial States. Two labor leaders in Washington recently boasted that they knew these laws were unconstitutional, but that they were going to obtain a reversal of the 1923 decision of the Supreme Court on this question.

The rights of working women have been further endangered by the entry of the United States into the International Labor Office. The bill authorizing this action was "sneaked" through Congress, so its labor proponents say, in the closing hours of the last session without public hearings, consideration in committee or debate on the floor of either house.

When the emergency regulations of the NRA expire, male workers will be freed from the emergency minimum-wage requirements, and be free for collective bargaining, while women will be under Federal and State laws restricting their industrial competition with men. Women will face the further menace of discriminatory international agreements of the I. L. O.—agreements which will undoubtedly reflect the reactionary attitude of European dictatorships toward women.

For some incomprehensible reason the New Deal has regarded unemployment and destitution among women as less pitiable than that of men. Federal relief itself has been characterized by sex discrimination. Perhaps women themselves are in a measure to blame for this, for the age-old truth that women bear suffering with more fortitude and less outcry than men has held true during the depression. Men thronged the breadlines and dramatized their need for relief. Women hid their plight. Nevertheless, as far back as March, 1933, it was well known that millions of women were out of work, and that an army of homeless girls, many under 21 years of age, were roaming the country. Mary Anderson, chief of the Federal Woman's Bureau, for months begged that women be given a definite place in the solution of industrial instability, and that their problems, especially those of married women, be considered with more tolerance. Responsible social workers joined in that plea, but the government did nothing for nearly eight months.

When the conference on women's needs was held at the White House, in November, 1933, Harry Hopkins, Federal Relief Administrator, admitted that "women as a group have had less attention than any other unemployed group . . . but the government now has the money and the determination to care for unemployed women. The government wants advice as to how to extend that relief. It has the

power to extend that relief. It has the power to give it, but it has not done what it should, and it feels pretty humble about it."

Representative Edith Rogers of Massachusetts, pointing out that no PWA projects had been established for women and that the CWA offered few opportunities for them, urged that, in allocating relief to the States, 20 per cent of these funds be ear-marked for women's projects. The Relief Administrator seemed to approve the plan.

Since then many relief projects for women have been set up, but the government has made no systematic demand for a proper distribution of work relief among women. No Federal projects have been planned to give work to women. No State funds have been earmarked for women's projects. As a result, the welfare of jobless women in many localities has been utterly neglected.

On the theory that women have no dependents, wages were set at $5 a day for men, and at $3 a day for women. The wage-rate on CWA projects, on which men were mostly employed, was from 10 to 20 cents an hour higher than on CWS projects, where women prevailed. Men were often placed in the higher paid, supervisory positions on strictly women's projects. Women on work relief have protested bitterly that married women and widows with families of children to support receive only 30 cents an hour, while unmarried boys receive 50 cents an hour for similar work.

Responsible estimates show but little reemployment among women because of the antagonism that still exists toward hiring women while men are out of work. Women are in a worse plight than ever because they have been systematically ousted from work, and have had fewer resources than men to fall back upon. FERA reports show that of the 1,600,000 now receiving Federal work relief only 142,000 are women.

Such, from the point of view of women, is the record of the New Deal. Seemingly the long struggle for women's right to work on an equal footing with men has not yet ended. It must go on under the New Deal even as under the old.

Feminist Notes

Mines Closed to Fiji Women

THE International Labor Office of the League of Nations reports that the mining regulations, 1934, for the Fiji Islands, issued under the mining ordinance of 1934, provide inter alia that no female shall be employed below ground in any mine.

Life Begins at Forty

AGE is no longer the deadline for woman's advance in business, according to a survey recently made by the National Federation of Professional and Business Women's Clubs.

The median for highest earnings was found to be among women over 50, but under 60 years of age. Two women in this group reported salaries of $25,000 a year, the peak for the study.

Earnings were found to increase with experience and age up to 60 years. For single women they were higher than for married women and highest generally for women employed in the northeast and east north central sections of the country, increasing with the size of the community.

Nation-Wide Discrimination

THE *Bulletin* of the Business Women's Legislative Council of California calls attention to the fact that "plans for nation-wide discrimination against women were given publicity for the first time in our State when Secretary of Labor Perkins spoke at the national convention of the American Federation of Labor in San Francisco the week of October 5. She said 'minimum wage laws, child labor laws, and laws for shortening the hours of labor for women will be introduced in twenty States this year and should be supported by local labor.'

The *Bulletin* continues:

"This looks like an attempt to make women the 'goat' a second time in the history of labor legislation. Minimum wage laws when first introduced into this country were absolutely rejected by the labor unions as curtailing their liberty and freedom of contract. The social workers then said: 'We will apply them to women only and, after trial, perhaps the men will adopt similar laws.' Now labor and industry are fighting the legal adoption of the 30-hour week, so it looks as though Miss Perkins plans to 'put it over' on the women. Is this fair? Is this loyalty to the best interests of women workers in these dark hours of depression? Many will lose their jobs and men be substituted."

News from the Field

Dr. Lonn Addresses Baltimore Branch

"JAPAN IN HER INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS", was the timely subject of an unusually interesting and informative address made by Dr. Ella Lonn, Professor of History at Goucher College, at the December meeting of the Baltimore Branch of the Woman's Party.

Dr. Lonn, who has attended sessions of the League of Nations in Geneva, was able to give to her narrative the vivid impressions of an actual onlooker at great world events. Beginning with the Disarmament Conference in Washington and Japan's disappointment at not winning a place in the front rank of world Powers, she cited the various moves since made by the land of the Mikado, among them her invasion of Manchuria and the maintenance of a neutral zone in China policed by Chinese—who are, however, officered by Japanese—and leading finally to the complete isolation of Japan through her withdrawal from the League of Nations.

Japan has succeeded in China largely because of the apathy of the other Powers, Dr. Lonn said. And the reasons for this indifference on the part of the other nations, each of whom, as explained by Dr. Lonn, is facing acute internal or international problems of its own, afforded an illuminating analysis of recent moves on the chess-board of foreign and domestic policies and events.

Dr. Lonn is a writer and historian as well as a member of the Goucher College faculty. Her last volume, entitled "Salt as a Factor in the Confederacy," came out during the summer and tells the story of the interesting role played by salt in the determination of the Civil War. The fact, so little known, that the Confederacy lacked salt and how the shortage of this valuable mineral and condiment reduced the effectiveness of the Confederate Army, as told by Dr. Lonn, makes a contribution to American history as authoritative as it is circumstantial. The titles of her other books are: "Reconstruction in Louisiana After 1868" (1918); "The Government of Maryland" (1921); and "Desertion During the Civil War" (1928).

Mrs. John M. Ogden of the Campaign Committee for Securing the Right of Jury Service for Maryland Women gave an encouraging report of the work of her Committee. Mrs. J. William Funck, president of the Baltimore Branch, presided.

Eastern Regional Conference to Be Held in January

THE next Conference under the auspices of the Eastern Regional Conference Committee of the National Woman's Party will be held January 26 and 27 in Washington, D. C. States included in the Eastern Region are Philadelphia, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. Dr. Arabel W. Clark, educator, of Philadelphia, is Chairman of the Committee. Members of the Party living in these States should plan to attend this important gathering at which, among other things, plans will be made for se-

curing the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment and the repeal of Section 213 of the Economy Act.

Mrs. Hilles Urges Susan B. Anthony Stamp

FLORENCE BAYARD HILLES, National Chairman of the Woman's Party, has written Postmaster-General James A. Farley to say that she could not "speak too strongly in favor of the proposed issuance of a postage stamp in memory of Susan B. Anthony.

"We earnestly ask," the letter continues, "that in your position, which makes such a proposal possible, you have such a stamp issued for the 115th anniversary of Miss Anthony's birth, February 15. Such a stamp will be an honor to a great stateswoman, as well as giving pleasure to thousands of women who worked with her, and those today who enjoy the fruits of her labor—the Nineteenth Amendment—better known as the Susan B. Anthony Amendment."

Correction

ALISON NEILANS, General Secretary of the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene, London, sends us the following:

In the issue of EQUAL RIGHTS, dated September 29, page 276, column 3, it is stated under the heading of "The International Council of Women" and referring to a meeting presided over by Madame Avril de Sainte-Croix that "licensed houses in France have been abolished."

I should be glad if you would publish in your paper a correction of this statement, as unfortunately the licensed houses in France have not been abolished. It is true that there is a growing movement in France for their abolition, thanks to the efforts of the "Union Temporaire," which has grown up out of the French branch of the International Abolitionist Federation, founded by Josephine Butler in 1875, but so far only fourteen towns in the whole of France have closed the licensed houses and, except in one case, namely, Grenoble, even these cities have retained the registration and special medical and police control of prostitutes which is, in fact, the licensing of women for purposes of prostitution instead of the licensing of houses.

Almost every town, even small towns in France, have the licensed house system, and France has introduced the same system into its mandated territories in Syria and in the Cameroons. Moreover, the Government of France was the prime mover in amending the International Convention on Traffic in Women, which was signed last year, in such a way that national traffic in women is no offence against the law, but only when the woman is moved from one country to another.

More Honor for Heroines

ROSE ARNOLD POWELL, of Washington, D. C., who has been asked by Alice Paul to serve as Chairman of the Susan B. Anthony Committee of the National Woman's Party, sends us the following:

"The following facts, quoted from the 'Handbook of the Hall of Fame,' should be known by club women throughout the country at this time, since there is presented an opportunity to secure honor for the pioneers of the woman movement, Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Lucy Stone, all of whom meet the time requirement for election. Surely all women can unite in securing recognition for these 'Mothers in Israel':

" 'Early in 1900, New York University announced a gift of $100,000, later increased to $250,000, for building a colonnade at the University, at University Heights, overlooking the Palisades and the Hudson and Harlem River Valleys, the exclusive use of the colonnade with its sub-structure being to serve perpetually as the Hall of Fame for Great Americans. Some years later the donor was revealed as Mrs. Finley J. Shepard (Helen Gould).

" 'In the election of 1930, four names were added, thus making the total number of tablets and busts in the Colonnade to date, sixty-nine. The quota for the next election in 1935 will be sixteen.

" 'In 1922, the margin of time after death at which a person becomes eligible to election was extended from ten to twenty-five years.

" 'In the year of the quinquennial election the Director of the Hall of Fame invites from the public the presentation of names to be inscribed in the Hall of Fame. Such names must be submitted between February 1 and March 15 and must be sent to the Director on a form obtained from him.

" 'Further information and documents relating to the Hall of Fame may be obtained from the Director (Dr. Robert Underwood Johnson) at its executive office, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York.'

"The women already elected to the Hall of Fame are: Harriet Beecher Stowe, Mary Lyon, Charlotte Cushman, Maria Mitchell, Emma Willard, Frances Elizabeth Willard, Alice Freeman Palmer.

"Please note that the American who made the Hall of Fame a reality was a *woman*. It was a man, the late Dr. Henry Mitchell MacCracken, who originated the idea. Let us see to it that Dr. MacCracken does not get all the glory. Recently a man was given credit at a banquet in his honor for preserving Mount Vernon. This honor belongs to a *woman*, Frances Cunningham. Columbus is lauded to the skies on Discovery Day, and Queen Isabella, the *woman* who made this discovery possible, is ignored. Men have the very bad habit of appropriating credit which does not belong to them, besides constantly covering their own sex with glory. Let us become more *woman conscious* and honor our heroines as men honor their heroes. Let's put a group of women in the Hall of Fame next year.

"In response to a recent letter of inquiry, Bertha L. Lyons, Assistant to the Director, wrote: 'In the case of an organization or association making a nomination, I should suggest that it would be better to have one blank filed for the candidate, and have the members of the organization who wish to endorse the candidacy sign the one blank.' "

A facsimile of the Christmas Card that will announce to your friend your gift of a subscription for Equal Rights. Order at once. Three subscriptions for the price of two.

Throughout all the coming year you will receive

Equal Rights

May the enjoyment of each new issue bring to your mind fresh thoughts of my lasting good wishes.

Donor's Name

ROOMS FOR VISITORS IN WASHINGTON

Headquarters of the National Woman's Party announces that several spacious, sunny rooms in Alva Belmont House at 144 B Street N. E., just a block from the Capitol, are available for the use of members of the National Woman's Party temporarily in Washington.

Rooms, $2.00

DAY PRINTING COMPANY
PUBLICATIONS AND BOOKS
600 East Lombard Street
Baltimore, Md.